

# PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

May 9, 2001

## CALL TO ORDER:

Vice-Chairman Dan Maks called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

## ROLL CALL:

Present were Vice Chairman Dan Maks, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen and Brian Lynott. Chairman Vlad Voytilla and Planning Commissioner Chuck Heckman were excused.

Senior Planner Alan Whitworth, Associate Planner Scott Whyte, Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Maks, who presented the format for the meeting.

## VISITORS:

Vice-Chairman Maks asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

## STAFF COMMUNICATION:

On question, staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

## OLD BUSINESS:

Vice-Chairman Maks opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

1  
2 **CONTINUANCES:**

3  
4 **A. CPA 2001-0008/RZ 2001-0008 - 1275 SW 158TH AVENUE**  
5 **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT AND REZONE**

6 *(Continued from April 25, 2001)*

7 This proposal is to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps to add a  
8 parcel being annexed into the City of Beaverton and to designate it Station  
9 Community on the Comprehensive Plan Map and Station Community – Multiple  
10 Use on the Zoning Map in place of the current Washington County designation of  
11 Transit Oriented Business. The parcel is located at 1275 SW 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue and is  
12 approximately 0.4 acres in size. Tax Lots 00800; Map 1S1 05CB.

13  
14 Observing that this Public Hearing had been continued on April 25, 2001, in order  
15 to obtain further information, Senior Planner Alan Whitworth mentioned that his  
16 efforts to resolve the access issue for this area with Washington County had not  
17 been successful as yet, adding that this property would be annexed and under the  
18 jurisdiction of the City of Beaverton on June 30, 2001. The property owner has  
19 stated that he is willing to have an access surveyed and recorded, within reason,  
20 providing that he knows what the County wants. Annexing or changing the  
21 zoning would not eliminate the access condition, and following annexation, any  
22 enforcement would be the responsibility of the City of Beaverton. He suggested  
23 that the Planning Commissioners have the option of either approving the CPA and  
24 Rezone without having the access issue resolved or continuing the Public Hearing  
25 to allow more time to resolve this issue.

26  
27 Principal Planner Hal Bergsma pointed out that the Planning Commission could  
28 proceed with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) and Rezone, adding  
29 that the access issue could be resolved at a later time.

30  
31 7:07 p.m. – Commissioner Barnard arrived.

32  
33 Vice-Chairman Maks requested clarification of whether this item would be  
34 included on the City Council's Consent Agenda.

35  
36 Mr. Bergsma informed Vice-Chairman Maks that if approved by the Planning  
37 Commission, this issue would then be reviewed by the City Council on their  
38 Consent Agenda.

39  
40 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

41  
42 On question, no member of the public appeared to testify on these applications.

43  
44 On question, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura indicated that he had no  
45 comments at this time.  
46

1 Observing that he had not been present for the first Public Hearing regarding this  
2 issue, Commissioner Johansen indicated that he intends to abstain from voting on  
3 this issue.

4  
5 On question, Commissioners Bliss, Lynott and Barnard and Vice-Chairman Maks  
6 all expressed their support of the applications as meeting applicable criteria.

7  
8 Commissioner Barnard **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a  
9 motion that CPA 2001-0008 – 1275 SW 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue Comprehensive Plan  
10 Amendment be approved, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits  
11 presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the background facts,  
12 findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated April 25, 2001, and  
13 based upon this Public Hearing.

14  
15 Commissioner Barnard made a friendly amendment to his motion to reflect that  
16 the Staff Report is dated April 5, 2001, rather than April 25, 2001.

17  
18 Motion, as amended, **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of  
19 Commissioner Johansen, who abstained from voting on this issue.

20  
21 Commissioner Barnard **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a  
22 motion that RZ 2001-0008 – 1275 SW 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue Rezone be approved, based  
23 upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the Public Hearing on  
24 the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the  
25 Staff Report dated April 5, 2001 and based upon this Public Hearing.

26  
27 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner Johansen,  
28 who abstained from voting on this issue.

29  
30 7:15 p.m. – Mr. Whitworth left.

31  
32 **NEW BUSINESS:**

33  
34 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

35  
36 **A. CUP 2001-0009 -- QWEST WIRELESS MONOPOLE AT 10700 SW**  
37 **BEAVERTON/HILLSDALE HWY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

38 The following land use application has been submitted for the placement of a  
39 telecommunications facility consisting of a monopole, a total of 80 feet in height  
40 with five-foot lighting rod extension for an overall height of 85 feet. The  
41 proposal includes panel antennas attached to the pole and ground-mounted  
42 equipment cabinets. The site proposed for placement of the facility is addressed  
43 at 10700 SW Beaverton Hillsdale Highway; Washington County Assessor's Map  
44 1S1-15AD on Tax Lot 2000. The site is zoned Industrial Park (IP) and is  
45 approximately 2.92 acres in size. Within the IP zone, facilities related to utility  
46 distribution are permitted with Conditional Use approval.

1 Associate Planner Scott Whyte presented the Staff Report and described the  
2 proposal for a telecommunications facility and related equipment, observing that  
3 the area is already enclosed. Referring to page 5 of the Staff Report, he observed  
4 that the Comprehensive Plan designation is Industrial Park (IP), rather than  
5 Campus Industrial (CI). He discussed the proposed Conditions of Approval,  
6 including two that had not been included in previous applications for  
7 telecommunications facilities. Concluding, he recommended approval of this  
8 application as meeting applicable criteria, and offered to respond to any questions  
9 or comments.

10  
11 Commissioner Bliss referred to page 1 of the Staff Report, specifically reference  
12 to an 80-foot pole, observing that several other references in the same document  
13 had indicated 83-feet and 85-feet.

14  
15 Mr. Whyte indicated that he would request that the applicant address this issue.

16  
17 Commissioner Barnard commended staff for addressing issues that had caused  
18 concern with previous monopoles.

19  
20 Mr. Whyte observed that while cost is an issue, many carriers are attempting to  
21 locate antennas on existing poles to avoid the public hearing process.

22  
23 Vice-Chairman Maks expressed his opinion that the proposed site is an excellent  
24 location for a monopole, suggesting that future monopoles be higher in order to  
25 increase the likelihood of collocation.

26  
27 Commissioner Johansen agreed that a greater effort should be made to encourage  
28 collocation of carriers.

29  
30 Vice-Chairman Maks suggested that as the newly appointed Monopole Czar, Mr.  
31 Whyte should determine where the monopoles are located and which are available  
32 for collocation.

33  
34 Mr. Whyte agreed that several options are available for monopole facilities.

35  
36 Vice-Chairman Maks requested information regarding the type of poles and/or  
37 antennas that are located on the *Shurgard* site on Highway 217 off of Denney  
38 Road, adding that these are preferable to the other facilities in the area.

39  
40 **APPLICANT:**

41  
42 **KEVIN MARTIN**, representing *W & H Pacific*, on behalf of *Qwest Wireless*,  
43 briefly discussed the application, adding that the applicant agrees with the  
44 proposed Conditions of Approval and offered to respond to any questions or  
45 comments. He advised Vice-Chairman Maks that the equipment on the *Shurgard*  
46 site had been installed by *Qwest Wireless* in 1997.

1        **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

2  
3        On question, no member of the public appeared to testify on this application.

4  
5        On question, Mr. Whyte commented that he had no further comments.

6  
7        On question, Mr. Naemura indicated that he had no comments at this time.

8  
9        The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

10  
11       On question, Commissioners Lynott, Johansen and Barnard and Vice-Chairman  
12       Maks all expressed their support of the application as meeting applicable criteria.

13  
14       Commissioner Bliss expressed his support of the application as meeting  
15       applicable criteria, suggesting that Condition of Approval No. 6 be amended to  
16       reflect that the applicant is responsible for removal of the wireless structure within  
17       six months of the date that the wireless operation ceases.

18  
19       Commissioner Barnard **MOVED** and Commissioner Lynott **SECONDED** a  
20       motion that CUP 2001-0009 – Qwest Wireless Monopole at 10700 SW  
21       Beaverton/Hillsdale Highway, be approved, based upon the testimony, reports and  
22       exhibits presented during the Public Hearing on the matter and upon the  
23       background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated May  
24       2, 2001, as modified, based upon this Public Hearing and subject to Conditions of  
25       Approval Nos. 1 through 8, and that Condition of Approval No. 6 be amended, as  
26       follows:

- 27  
28                6. Applicant shall be responsible for removal of **wireless** structure within  
29                six months of the date that wireless operation ceases.

30  
31       Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

32  
33       7:40 p.m. – Mr. Whyte left.

34  
35       **WORK SESSION:**

36  
37       **MERLO STATION AREA PLAN:**

38  
39       Observing that he represents Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, the Project Manager  
40       for this project, who is ill, Principal Planner Hal Bergsma mentioned that while he  
41       is not as familiar with this project as Ms. Fryer, he does have some pretty good  
42       knowledge of the issues. Noting that this issue had last been discussed by the  
43       Planning Commission in October of 2000, he pointed out that this project is  
44       funded by the grant from the State's Transportation Growth Management (TGM)  
45       Program. He explained that the City of Beaverton had applied for and received  
46       this grant in order to develop a specific plan for the area located to the south of

1 Merlo Road between 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the Merlo Road Light Rail Station. He  
2 commented that this area has been designated as a Station Community on the  
3 Metro 2040 Growth Concept Map, adding that the Planning Commission has also  
4 approved the new Land Use Element Map providing this same designation. He  
5 explained that the City of Beaverton is attempting to change this industrial-type  
6 area into a more transit-oriented development. Observing that this Work Session  
7 had originally been scheduled for the meeting of April 18, 2001, he stated that a  
8 lengthy Public Hearing had forced staff to continue this Work Session until today.  
9 He referred to two Memorandums, dated April 7, 2001, and April 18, 2001, both  
10 of which provide information and attachments regarding this issue. He mentioned  
11 comments received from Blair Crumpacker of Washington County, Pat Russell,  
12 Steve Bozak of Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, and Jerome Gill and  
13 Jim Olson of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District Nature Park  
14 Advisory Committee. He described several Stakeholders' Meetings, at which  
15 issues and development of the area had been discussed. He pointed out that the  
16 most intense development would occur in Area 1 near the Light Rail Transit  
17 Station, adding that there also would be some transit-oriented type development in  
18 Area 2 along Merlo Road, although the density would be slightly lower. He  
19 mentioned that Area 3 would allow what is currently located in the area, including  
20 bus storage, maintenance, the school district's office building and other  
21 operations. He stated that some of the uses in Areas 1 and 2 would not be  
22 consistent with transit-oriented development, although they would be recognized  
23 as existing uses and could continue as long as desired. He emphasized that they  
24 would not be considered non-conforming but would be recognized in the code as  
25 being allowed uses. He pointed out that he would like to discuss which uses  
26 would be allowed in each area this evening, noting that primary differences would  
27 involve setback requirements and minimum density requirements, in terms of  
28 floor area ration (FAR) with Area 3 not having any minimum FAR requirement.  
29 He discussed the possibility of creating a Station Community Employment  
30 District for Areas 1 and 2 and a Station Community Light Industrial District for  
31 Area 3. He mentioned that the Public Hearing for the different applications for  
32 this plan (CPA 2001-0011 – Merlo Station Area Plan Map; CPA 2001-0012 –  
33 Merlo Station Area Plan Text; TA 2001-0006 – Merlo Station Area Plan  
34 Development Code; and RZ 2001-0013 – Merlo Station Area Plan Rezone) is  
35 scheduled for June 6, 2001, emphasizing that any expenditures for this TGM grant  
36 must be completed by the end of June 2001.

37  
38 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to Ms. Fryer's Memorandum dated April 18, 2001,  
39 and discussed Item Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4, questioning whether any of the  
40 Commissioners have any issues with these items. He discussed the possibility of  
41 locating an extended-stay hotel in the area, emphasizing that he would prefer that  
42 this not be considered as an outright use.

43  
44 Mr. Naemura discussed the history of the issue regarding bookbinderies,  
45 observing that the Planning Commission had limited the size of this use.  
46

1 Vice-Chairman Maks observed that while printing companies have a lot of  
2 employees, book binderies do not, although the equipment utilizes a great deal of  
3 space.

4  
5 Mr. Naemura pointed out that the institutional knowledge of that requirement  
6 most likely resides with former Community Development Director Elaine  
7 Wilkerson.

8  
9 Observing that these areas do not currently have manufacturing, Mr. Bergsma  
10 questioned which types of manufacturing, if any, should be allowed in this  
11 particular area.

12  
13 Vice-Chairman Maks requested a clarification of printing, specifically whether  
14 Laser Quick would be considered printing.

15  
16 Mr. Bergsma advised Vice-Chairman Maks that staff would consider Laser Quick  
17 to be a service, which is allowed.

18  
19 Vice-Chairman Maks suggested a square-footage limitation on any outright use,  
20 adding that any larger uses could require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

21  
22 Mr. Bergsma mentioned the amount of employment generated by a bindery.

23  
24 Vice-Chairman Maks informed Mr. Bergsma that binderies do not generate a  
25 great deal of employment, although printing companies actually have quite a few  
26 employees.

27  
28 Commissioner Barnard expressed his support of Vice-Chairman Maks' proposal  
29 that square-footage determine what is allowable outright use.

30  
31 Mr. Bergsma questioned what the maximum square footage should be for an  
32 outright use.

33  
34 Vice-Chairman Maks suggested that 5,000 square feet should be the maximum for  
35 an outright use.

36  
37 The Planning Commission then addressed the issue of whether parks should be  
38 allowed, and if so, whether they should be limited to a maximum of ½ acre in  
39 size.

40  
41 Commissioner Barnard questioned the cost of land, and Mr. Bergsma advised him  
42 that any urban land would probably cost at least ¼ million dollars per acre.

43  
44 Observing that any site for a park must be sufficient to add trees and other  
45 amenities, Vice-Chairman Maks noted that anything too small would not function.

46

1 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that it might be necessary in some instances to allow for  
2 smaller parks.

3  
4 Vice-Chairman Maks mentioned that the small park located by the transit mall in  
5 Vancouver, Washington is a disaster area, adding that he would prefer one park  
6 that works to three that do not work.

7  
8 Vice-Chairman Maks discussed Item No. 5, relating to site development  
9 requirements. The first issue addressed was whether a 25-foot setback should be  
10 applied to all buildings abutting residentially zoned property.

11  
12 Mr. Bergsma reminded him that this particular area abuts the Nature Park, which  
13 is presently zoned R-2 Residential, adding that the intent is to adopt a new quasi-  
14 public zone to be applied to the park and eliminating the necessity of a setback.

15  
16 Vice-Chairman Maks suggested elimination of the 25-foot setback.

17  
18 Mr. Naemura asked Vice-Chairman Maks his opinion of the concept already  
19 occurring in some of the industrial areas, specifically what he referred to as a  
20 "super-setback", near an abutting residentially developed area.

21  
22 Vice-Chairman Maks informed Mr. Naemura that any development that exceeds a  
23 certain height increases the setback.

24  
25 Mr. Bergsma clarified that the higher the building, the greater the setback.

26  
27 Vice-Chairman Maks pointed out that a developer in Vancouver had been made to  
28 rebuild an eleven-story building with a four-story parking garage due to site  
29 issues.

30  
31 Mr. Bergsma discussed the sixty percent maximum lot coverage requirement for  
32 the Light Industrial (LI) district, adding that he believes that this includes the  
33 parking area.

34  
35 Commissioner Barnard pointed out that a lot of landscaping might not be desired  
36 in this particular area.

37  
38 Vice-Chairman Maks questioned the opinion of his fellow Commissioners  
39 regarding the maximum floor area ratio (FAR).

40  
41 Mr. Bergsma expressed his opinion that there is some merit to establishing a  
42 maximum FAR, adding that there would also be requirements for adequate  
43 landscaping, parking and other features.

44  
45 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to Item No. 6, specifically relating to design  
46 standards and access spacing.



1 Mr. Bergsma noted that some design criteria are in effect at this time, observing  
2 that these should be clarified and made more objective, if possible. He mentioned  
3 that Washington County's special Transit Oriented Development (TOD)  
4 provisions for access apply to local and collector streets, not arterial streets.

5  
6 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to Item No. 7 in the Memorandum dated April 18,  
7 2001.

8  
9 Mr. Bergsma clarified that Item No. 7 serves more of an explanatory function,  
10 adding that he does not anticipate additional questions on Item Nos. 7, 8 or 9.

11  
12 Vice-Chairman Maks requested clarification of the Community Plan.

13  
14 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that the proposed Community Plan is in the packet  
15 attached to the Memorandum dated April 7, 2001.

16  
17 Vice-Chairman Maks discussed several of the policies included in the proposed  
18 Community Plan, pointing out that he has a problem with attempting to designate  
19 a five-lane road as a major pedestrian route, emphasizing that it is not functional.

20  
21 Commissioner Johansen mentioned that the first thing to be eliminated from any  
22 road is the portion of the right-of-way that makes it pedestrian-friendly.

23  
24 Mr. Bergsma expressed his opinion that designing a five-lane road as a pedestrian  
25 route would occur more frequently in the future, adding that this is why Metro has  
26 adopted their boulevard design guidelines, which will hopefully have a more  
27 pedestrian-friendly effect.

28  
29 Referring to Evergreen Parkway, a four-lane arterial with a landscaped median  
30 through the Tanasbourne area, Commissioner Bliss expressed his opinion that the  
31 area is extremely pedestrian-friendly.

32  
33 Mr. Bergsma agreed that Evergreen Parkway is an excellent example of a  
34 pedestrian-friendly road.

35  
36 Commissioner Bliss pointed out that it is extremely difficult to get a landowner to  
37 cooperate with this significant setback.

38  
39 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to the area off of 158<sup>th</sup> Avenue, specifically Cornell  
40 Oaks, adding that this street consists of four lanes.

41  
42 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that Shute Road south of Evergreen Parkway is another  
43 pedestrian-friendly road. He questioned whether Vice-Chairman Maks is  
44 concerned with the requirement of a certain building design along this route that  
45 might not be appropriate.

1 Vice-Chairman Maks advised Mr. Bergsma that his concern is with the potential  
2 for having to give up additional land.

3  
4 Mr. Bergsma assured Vice-Chairman Maks that this is not the intent, adding that  
5 whether or not a street is designated as a major pedestrian route, staff would like  
6 to see this route resemble Evergreen Parkway, with reasonably wide sidewalks,  
7 street trees and a median.

8  
9 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to page 4 of policies, observing that the two B's  
10 should probably be B and C.

11  
12 Mr. Bergsma referred to C in the Staff Report for the meeting of June 6, 2001,  
13 observing that the wording of the policy had been changed, as follows: "within  
14 the Merlo Station area aim for an average of 45 employees per acre", rather than  
15 adopting the goal.

16  
17 Commissioner Bliss referred to page 4, item B, specifically the parking lot  
18 situation, asking where these vehicles would go.

19  
20 Mr. Bergsma suggested that parking structures are one possibility, although this  
21 would not be feasible for buses.

22  
23 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to policies, specifically the last sentence in "A",  
24 requesting that it be amended, as follows: "while allowing existing uses to  
25 continue without ~~undue~~ restrictions..." He referred to Action 1, requesting that it  
26 be amended, as follows "uses to continue without ~~necessarily~~ becoming non-  
27 conforming uses..."

28  
29 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that the Staff Report for the June 6, 2001, meeting,  
30 observing that staff has proposed changing Action 3, under Goal 2, Policy A, on  
31 page 5, as follows: "...~~allow~~ limit the use of a 30-foot wide..."

32  
33 Referring to the Development Code, Vice-Chairman Maks mentioned the purpose  
34 statement and questioned whether ½ mile would be used as a frame of reference.

35  
36 Commissioner Barnard commented that Commissioner Heckman had also  
37 questioned the method for measuring this ½ mile.

38  
39 Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Barnard that the ½ mile would be measured  
40 "as the crow flies". On question, he informed Vice-Chairman Maks that a ½ mile  
41 walk from Merlo Station would most likely be at approximately 170<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

42  
43 Vice-Chairman Maks referred to page LU-2, A.11, specifically: "Public services  
44 or utility uses, confined to the area used as of the adoption of this ordinance."  
45 Observing that he is not certain that he is in agreement with this, he pointed out  
46 that this could limit expansion of existing uses.

1 Mr. Bergsma agreed that there should be some determination of how much to  
2 limit the expansion of existing uses.

3  
4 Emphasizing that he disagrees with this concept, Vice-Chairman Maks stated that  
5 he would like to allow for the expansion of existing uses.

6  
7 Commissioner Barnard expressed concern with creating special zoning to  
8 accommodate the school district that could later be used to allow a local junkyard.

9  
10 Vice-Chairman Maks pointed out that the use specifies public services or utilities.

11  
12 Mr. Bergsma questioned whether nursery and childcare should be included under  
13 permitted uses, and it was determined that it should.

14  
15 Vice-Chairman Maks requested clarification of whether an increase in density in  
16 the area of the Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District's Nature Park would  
17 increase the likelihood of a fire in the nature park in the event that one of the  
18 homes in the area caught fire. Observing that he had grown up in northwest  
19 Portland when the Western Forestry Center had burnt down, he emphasized that  
20 he is concerned with precautionary measures for the protection of the facility.

21  
22 Mr. Bergsma advised Vice-Chairman Maks that current fire codes are far stricter  
23 than they were at that time, pointing out that the Western Forestry Center was a  
24 wooden building, adding that this type of structure is no longer common and that  
25 we have access to one of the best fire districts in the country.

26  
27 Vice-Chairman Maks questioned how much experience our fire district has with  
28 forest fires.

29  
30 Mr. Bergsma assured Vice-Chairman Maks that he has confidence in the fire  
31 district personnel's ability to deal with a forest fire. Observing that the Planning  
32 Commissioners would have an additional opportunity to comment at the Public  
33 Hearing that is scheduled for June 6, 2001, he suggested that final amendments  
34 and ideas could be reviewed and appropriate revisions made at that time.

35  
36 Commissioner Johansen questioned when there would be a review of the  
37 Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan.

38  
39 Mr. Bergsma advised Commissioner Johansen that this would be done shortly,  
40 along with amendments to the map. He mentioned that while the Planning  
41 Commission would be reviewing four applications, the main focus would be on  
42 the new Community Plan and the new Zoning District.

43  
44 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

45

1 Observing that next week's meeting had been cancelled due to the lack of agenda  
2 items, Vice-Chairman Maks reminded his fellow Commissioners that there will  
3 be a Work Session at 6:30 p.m. on that day (Wednesday, May 16, 2001).  
4

5 Mr. Bergsma mentioned that food would be provided at this Work Session,  
6 adding that staff would like to discuss all of the upcoming projects scheduled  
7 throughout the remainder of 2001.  
8

9 Mr. Bergsma questioned whether everyone is aware that Principal Planner Irish  
10 Bunnell has officially resigned, adding that his final scheduled day of work is  
11 Friday, May 18, 2001.  
12

13 Vice-Chairman Maks commented that he is not happy to see Mr. Bunnell leave  
14 the City of Beaverton.  
15

16 The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.